

# **EXHIBIT B**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

5 UGOCHUKWO GOODLUCK NWAUZOR, )  
6 et al., )  
7 Plaintiffs, ) 3:17-cv-05769-RJB  
8 v. ) 3:17-cv-05806-RJB  
9 THE GEO GROUP, INC., ) Tacoma, Washington  
10 Defendant. ) June 17, 2021  
11 STATE OF WASHINGTON, ) Jury Question  
12 Plaintiff, ) 9:00 a.m.  
13 v. )  
14 THE GEO GROUP, INC., )  
15 Defendant. )  
16 )

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT J. BRYAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

25                    Proceedings stenographically reported and transcribed  
                          With computer-aided technology

1  
2  
3 APPEARANCES  
4  
5  
6

For the Plaintiff  
Nwauzor, et al.: JAMAL N. WHITEHEAD  
ADAM J. BERGER  
Schroeter Goldmark & Bender  
810 Third Avenue  
Suite 500  
Seattle, Washington

For the Plaintiff  
State of Washington: ANDREA BRENNEKE  
LANE POLOZOLA  
MARSHA J. CHIEN  
800 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2000  
Seattle, Washington

For the Defendant  
The GEO Group: LAWRENCE D. SILVERMAN  
ADRIENNE SCHEFFY  
Akerman LLP  
1900 Sixteenth Street  
Suite 1700  
Denver, Colorado

JOAN K. MELL  
III Branches Law PLLC  
1019 Regents Boulevard  
Suite 204  
Fircrest, Washington

1 MORNING SESSION

2 JUNE 17, 2021

3 (The following occurred outside the presence of the jury.)

4 THE COURT: Have you all had a chance to read the  
5 latest from the jury?

6 MS. MELL: Yes, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: The appropriate thing for me to do in the  
8 face of this note is to ask the jury back into the courtroom  
9 with the typical questions when a jury might be hung, in part  
10 or wholly, and ask them if there is a reasonable possibility  
11 that they reach a verdict -- that they could reach a verdict  
12 within a reasonable time on either or both interrogatories  
13 submitted to the jury and hear their response, and then send  
14 them back to deliberate and we will discuss their response.

15 That's what I propose to do, unless someone has a comment.

16 MS. MELL: It would be GEO's position the jury has  
17 expressed, after two and a half days of deliberation, that it  
18 is, in fact, in conflict and cannot reach a decision, and the  
19 verdict should be -- the decision of the jury should be  
20 declared hung at this point, without further deliberation.

21 THE COURT: Well, it is premature in light of their  
22 indication that they are uncertain about reaching a  
23 conclusion, at least on one point. I think your suggestion  
24 is premature.

25 Any other comment?

1                   THE CLERK: I will put them out into a different  
2 room.

3                   (The following occurred outside the presence of the jury.)

4                   THE COURT: A lot of work down the tube. I am not  
5 sure what you want to do about resetting. I would think it  
6 would make sense to not do that rashly between now and the  
7 resetting and think this through, find out from the jurors  
8 what they thought. We can leave it up to a motion to reset  
9 or whatever. I have in the past with cases much more simple  
10 than this to say, okay, we will start Monday morning. I  
11 don't think that makes sense in this case with the number of  
12 witnesses and so forth and the planning that it takes.

13                  Shall we leave it up to a motion to reset?

14                  MS. CHIEN: The State of Washington still has a Phase  
15 3 claim on the unjust enrichment claim, which we believe  
16 should still proceed regardless of the verdict here. It is a  
17 bench trial. It is not before a jury. Our position is we  
18 should move forward on the unjust enrichment claim.

19                  MS. MELL: GEO would oppose doing that or setting  
20 that at this point. GEO needs an opportunity to digest this,  
21 figure out where we are, communicate with our client, and see  
22 where that leaves us with the various parties involved. It  
23 is warranted, at least at this phase, to at least have a  
24 conversation and figure it out.

25                  THE COURT: The problem with that, Ms. Chien, is

1 after much work and sweat on the part of the Court and my  
2 court staff, I determined that there was a fact question that  
3 was presentable to a jury on the issue of whether the  
4 detainees are, in fact, employees of GEO. That still has to  
5 be answered. I don't know how we can have an unjust  
6 enrichment case without the question being answered. There  
7 is, I think, a right to a jury trial on that issue.

8 MS. CHIEN: Your Honor, I think our position has  
9 always been that the minimum wage claim is separate and  
10 distinct from the unjust enrichment claim and does not depend  
11 on a finding the detainees are actually employees. I think  
12 it is clear, and I think it makes sense to move forward with  
13 the case as is, given the judge has just been able to hear  
14 all the evidence presented and it is fresh in the Court's  
15 mind that regardless of whether or not the detainees are  
16 employees, that GEO has clearly been unjustly enriched by  
17 relying on detainees to clean and work the kitchen on 90  
18 percent of his facilities without paying them, if not the  
19 minimum wage, a wage, a prevailing wage, and profited off  
20 that labor. We believe that claim can move forward separate  
21 from any finding on whether or not the detainees are  
22 employees.

23 THE COURT: Ms. Chien, my reaction is negative to  
24 your argument. I'll tell you this, I think what I am going  
25 to do is to allow any post-trial motions that you want to